



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,178	06/19/2001	Wendy Naimark	12013/58201	9892
23838	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON 1500 K STREET NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			HAN, MARK K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,178

Applicant(s)

NAIMARK ET AL.

Examiner

Mark K. Han

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12, 14, 15 and 19-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 16, 17 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/15/01; 11/18/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 11 April 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that search of the all of the pending claims would not be burdensome on the grounds that the subject matter falls within the same class. This is not found persuasive because searching all inventions would cause serious burden to the examiner. MPEP §803 states,

For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be *prima facie* shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP §808.02. That *prima facie* showing may be rebutted by appropriate showings or evidence by the applicant.

Inventions classified in different subclasses are considered to of separate classification.

Applicants have not presented persuasive showings or evidence to rebut the examiner's *prima facie* showing.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-12, 14, 15 and 19-23 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention/species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11 April 2005. With respect to claim 15, it appears that subject matter of claim 15 is drawn to Figure 7 (Species VI), a nonelected species. Applicant has not suggested whether claim 13 is generic to more than one species. Applicant is reminded that upon the allowance of a generic claim, the restriction requirement as to the linked species shall be withdrawn and any

Art Unit: 3763

claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application.

### *Claim Objections*

3. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites the limitation "the extraction chamber" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 13, 16, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,884,871 to Polaschegg.

Polaschegg discloses a first lumen 14, second lumen 30, exit orifice 16, mixing chamber 24 and selectively permeable membrane 22. See Figures 1 and 2.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3763

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polaschegg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,482 to Mitrani.

Polaschegg discloses the claimed invention as shown above. Polaschegg, however, does not disclose the claimed materials. Mitrani suggests glass fibers and polycarbonates as suitable filters. See col. 13, lines 13-29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Polaschegg by using the materials suggested by Mitrani for the filter in order to prevent nontherapeutic materials from entering the body.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### *Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 6,758,828 discloses the general state of the art with regards to catheters with semipermeable membranes.

#### *Contact Information*

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark K. Han whose telephone number is 571-272-4958. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark K. Han  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3763

mkh  
June 27, 2005



**NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**